

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/462,387	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DANIEL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Callie E. Shosho	<b>Art Unit</b> 1714	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** Allowed

 (1) Callie E. Shosho.

 (3) Alan Csontos.

 (2) Rochelle Seide.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 19 February 2004
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

16

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. Part II above.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner's amendment was agreed to and authorized by Ms. Seide. The amendment to claim 16 was made in order to ensure that claim 16 properly further limits the subject matter of the claim on which it depends, i.e. claim 13, while the amendment was made to the abstract in order that the abstract only contain one paragraph as is required.